



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,388	08/29/2000	Ilario A. Coslovi	5699-15	8495

21324 7590 05/13/2003

HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP
TWIN OAKS ESTATE
1225 W. MARKET STREET
AKRON, OH 44313

EXAMINER

JULES, FRANTZ F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3617

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/650,388

Applicant(s)

COSLOVI ET AL.

Examiner

Frantz F. Jules

Art Unit

3617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 33-46 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-7, 9, 10, 13-15, 20, 23-26 and 28-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22 and 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 4, line 4, the phrase "a pivot pin" should be replaced by --another pivot pin-- to avoid indefiniteness in the claim.

In claim 4, line 4, the phrase "a collar" should be replaced by --a second collar--to avoid indefiniteness in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 3-7, 9-10, 13-15, 20, 23, 24-26, 29-32 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Black, Jr et al (US 5,782,187).

Claims 3-7, 9-10, 13-15, 20, 23, 24-26, 29-32

Black Jr et al teach all the limitations of claims 3-7, 9-10, 13-15, 20, 23, 24-26, 29-32 by showing in figs 1-9, a railroad car bridge plate operable to permit a vehicle to be conducted between two rail road cars, said bridge plate comprising a beam (32) locatable in a longitudinal orientation of sufficient length to span a gap between a pair of adjacent railroad cars (22a, 22b), said beam (32) having an upwardly facing track surface or flange (34) for vehicle to ride on, said beam (16) having a first pivot fitting

Art Unit: 3617

(106a) which is a linear extension slot allowing mounting of the beam to the railroad car (22a, 22b), said beam having a second fitting (106b) for engaging a second railroad car (22b), said fittings being operable to accommodate yawing of said beam relative to the first or second railroad cars (22a, 22b) when said beam is located in the longitudinal orientation and the railroad cars in motion and one of said first and second fittings and said fitting permitting movement in a cross-wise orientation relative to the first railroad car when said beam is disengaged from the second railroad car. The yawing motion of the beam in a direction transverse to the longitudinal plane of the railcars will result whenever the two railroad cars are to be disconnected since the pins must be loosened from their collars.

Said fitting consisting of collars (111, 102) for receiving a vertical pivot pin (105), said bridge plate being translatable relative to said second axis and one of the pivot pins being disengageable if proper tooling is available to loosen pin 105 from the collars as shown in fig. 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8, 12, 18, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black Jr et al'187 in view of Thompson'478.

Claims 8, 12, 18, 28

Art Unit: 3617

Black Jr et al teach all the limitations of claim 8, 12, 18, 28 except for a railroad car bridge plate having traction bars on the upper surface and a hand grab mounted thereto. The general concept of using traction bars on the top surface of an Aluminum bridge plate assembly of two railroad car units is well known in the art as illustrated by Bell et al, see fig. 1, column 1, lines 60-67, column 2, lines 49-51. Also, the general concept of adding a hand grab to the bridge plate assembly of a railroad car unit is well known in the art as illustrated by Thompson'478. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Black Jr et al to include the use of traction bars on the top surface of an Aluminum bridge plate assembly in his advantageous bridge plate as taught by Bell et al in order reduce slippage on the bridge plate assembly thereby increasing safety. In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Black Jr et al to include the use of a hand grab to the bridge plate assembly in his advantageous bridge plate as taught by Thompson'478 in order to facilitate rotation of the bridge plate when the railroad cars are disconnected for service.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 11,16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Claims 33-46 stand allowable.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 3617

8. Applicant's arguments filed 03/24/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Summary of applicant's argument

In the amendment, applicant traversed the rejection of the newly amended claims 3-10, 12-15, 18, 20, 23-26, 28-32 for the following reasons:

1. The reference cited in the 102 rejection, Johnson, fails to disclose a bridge plate capable of staying in position spanning the gap between adjacently coupled rail road cars while the train is in motion.
2. The reference cited in the 102 rejection, Black Jr et al, fails to meet the limitations of the claims as it disclose permanently mounted bridge plates mounted between railroad cars.
3. The references cited in the 103 rejections, Russels cannot be properly combined with Johnson as it would destroy the function of Johnson.
4. The cited reference Bell et al fails to disclose traction bars to meet the limitations of claim 8.
5. The combination rejection of Black Jr et al and Thompson is improper as Black Jr et al is designed to remain in position while Thompson is designed to remain in position.

B. Response to applicant's argument

1. Applicant's argument No. 1 is moot in view of the withdrawal of the rejection based on Johnson.
2. In response to applicant's argument number two, it must be recognized that Black Jr et al meet all the limitations of claims 3-7, 9-10, 13-15, 20, 23, 24-26, 29-32 as

Art Unit: 3617

explained above since nowhere in Black Jr et al reference that the recitation of permanently mounted bridge plates is found as argued by applicant. Black Jr et al disclose bridge plates that are held stationary in operation to span the gap between two railroad cars, and the connection between the bridge plates (32) and the railroad car (22) is shown in Figs. 8-9. This connection is in no way a permanent connection as argued by applicant. The connection is such that the beam is disengageable from the railroad car whenever needed as explained above.

3. Applicant's argument No. 3 is moot in view of the withdrawal of Johnson.

4. Applicant argument No. 4 is moot in view of the withdrawal of Bell and of the new grounds of rejection.

5. Regarding applicant's argument number 5, it should be noted that the combination rejection was simply based on a teaching of a handle that is disclosed by the prior art of record, Thompson, which disclose a handle attached to the side of a bridge plate for the purpose of moving the plate out of position. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the handle of Thompson into Black Jr et al for the purpose of rotating the bridge plate out of position during service of the railroad cars and come up with the claim invention. Applicant's argument that the two arts are opposite in direction is weak to overcome the fact that one of ordinary skill in the art would incorporate a handle into Black Jr et al.

Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3617

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz F. Jules whose telephone number is (703) 308-8780. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph S. Morano can be reached on (703) 308-0230. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Application/Control Number: 09/650,388


Page 8

Art Unit: 3617

Frantz F. Jules
Examiner
Art Unit 3617

FFJ

May 9, 2003



S. JOSEPH MORANO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600